

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-44 are presently active in this case. Claims 17, 24, and 36 have been amended and Claim 30 has been canceled by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,329,922 to McCormick; Claims 24-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over McCormick in view of Webster's Third New International Dictionary; Claim 18-23 and 30-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 2-92837 to Kuramoto et al.; and Claims 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,934,112 to Jackson.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of an interview granted to Applicants' attorney at which time the outstanding issues were discussed. It was agreed during the interview that applicants would amend Claim 17 as it is amended herein. No further rejection of Claim 17 and its dependents is therefore anticipated. Regarding independent Claims 24 and 36, no agreement was reached. Applicants also acknowledge with appreciation the indication that Claims 1-5, 7-16, and 40-44 are allowable.

Claim 24 has been amended to include the limitation of dependent Claim 30. Regarding Claim 30, the office action asserts that it is unpatentable over McCormick in view of Kuramoto et al. because Kuramoto et al. teach "that the temperature difference is 50-400° Celsius which encompasses all of applicant's claimed temperature differences. Applicants respectfully traverse that assertion. Applicants respectfully point out that Kuramoto et al. merely teaches that the glass sheet is heated to 50 to 400° Celsius. There is no teaching or

Application No. 09/558,083
Reply to Office Action of May 22, 2003

suggestion that the work piece and waste piece are heated (cooled) to a temperature differential of greater than 100°. Consequently, McCormick is not believed to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter defined by Claim 24 (as amended) when considered alone or combination with Kuramoto et al.

Claim 36 has been amended to clarify that the product piece includes a data recording surface and involves moving the product piece without contacting the data recording surface of the product piece. Applicants submit that none of the applied art teaches such a feature. Hence, Claim 36 is believed to be in condition for allowance

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220

W. Todd Baker
Richard D. Kelly
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 27,757
W. Todd Baker
Registration No. 45,265

I:\ATTY\WTB\225643\AMENDMENT 15 JUL 03.DOC